

Since passage of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and the "deregulation" of cable television, consumers have seen their rates jump an average of 59 percent -- with some areas experiencing even more dramatic increases. The cost of cable modem service remains out of reach for many households, holding constant for years and selectively underserving rural and low-income Americans. The American people are watching the digital divide widen even as the need for access to high-speed networks increases.

The FCC, through this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, recognizes that new video competition is entering the market, as phone companies (like AT&T and Verizon) begin to roll out television service. The

Commission asks if the telephone companies are slowed or blocked in their expansion by the process of negotiating franchises - the agreements that companies seeking to provide video services sign with local governments that set the terms for building cable television systems.

These franchise agreements guarantee that local governments control rights-of-way and obtain fair rents from the companies that dig them up to lay cable. They guarantee universal build-out of the technology and its advantages to every household in the community, not just affluent neighborhoods. They guarantee public access television (and funding to provide it) as well

as other services
like low-cost
broadband for our
schools and
libraries.

Though the
franchising process
has not been
perfect, it has been
a critical safeguard
to protect the
interests of
consumers and
citizens in our
local communities.
Now that the phone
companies are
building television
systems, local
communities are
hungry for new
competition that
could drive down
costs, increase
options, provide
access to local
content and bring us
closer to bridging
the digital divide.

Does the franchising
process need reform?

Perhaps. However,
the most important
issue is not how to
ensure the process
is changed to suit

the interests of
telephone companies.
Instead, the most
important issue is
how to ensure that
the rights and
services of local
communities are
protected and
enriched. We should
start with these
desired outcomes and
work backward to see
if the process to
deliver them can be
improved. Local
governments
undoubtedly will -
and must - play a
key role in any
future franchising
process.

As new franchising
rules are
considered, a number
of market realities
must be taken into
account. There is a
distinct lack of
independent
programming,
particularly local
independent
programming, on
cable systems. This
is largely the
result of vertical
and horizontal

consolidation among the largest media companies and cable providers. We are required to buy channels we don't want or need because the cable operators bundle them together. The quality of customer service often reflects the fact that cable television is not a competitive market. The mere presence of satellite providers does not drive down rates nor present an affordable alternative for broadband access.

In many communities, the only truly independent sources of local news, information and culture come from the public channels produced at community media centers. They are the only way many citizens see local government in action and often the only way residents get

information about events happening close to home. Some towns have been able to negotiate for funding to enhance and expand these resources. Others have obtained wired schools and libraries, resources for e-medicine, government efficiency programs and other educational initiatives. All use their negotiating power to ensure the entire community is served.

The risk of supplying "one size fits all" franchises to new providers is the elimination of these and other valuable services that fulfill important public policy aims. There is surely a need for new providers of broadband and video content to enter existing markets, be they private or public.

However, no matter the level at which 'franchises' to new providers are granted - be it local, state, or national - local communities cannot be cut out of the process. They must be allowed to lend their voice to how new video and broadband systems will be implemented and what features will be available to meet future needs.